



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/336,612    06/18/99    BENDINER    B    9850/3

IM22/0103

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
NBC TOWER  
SUITE 3600  
P O BOX 10395  
CHICAGO IL 60610

EXAMINER

CROSS, L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1743

DATE MAILED:

01/03/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/336,612

Applicant(s)

Bendliner

Examiner

LaT ya Cr ss

Group Art Unit

1743

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 23, 2000

☒ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle* 1835 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) 3-5 is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.

☐ Claims are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received:

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 1743

### DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Applicants' remarks filed on October 23, 2000 and entered as Paper No. 11. Claims 1-5 are pending in the instant application. Claims 3-5 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to non-elected subject matter.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 2 remain to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,965,549 to Purwar et al (hereinafter Purwar et al '549).

Applicant's invention is directed to an aqueous solution comprising potassium sorbate dissolved in tap or deionized water at a concentration of 0.3% or higher and having a pH of 4.5 or higher.

Purwar et al '549 teaches aqueous pharmaceutical solutions which comprise *inter alia* potassium sorbate as a preservative. The potassium sorbate is disclosed as being an effective preservative at concentrations of preferably 0.05 to 0.5 weight percent (col. 4, lines 40-44). The pH of the solutions are disclosed as being preferably 4.75 (col. 4, lines 24-31).

Art Unit: 1743

Purwar et al '549 differ from the instantly claimed invention in that there is no specific example which uses 0.3 weight percent of potassium sorbate, however, since this amount is encompassed by the range of recited by the reference and is disclosed as being an effective amount for preserving, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select this amount for the aqueous solutions.

Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, Applicants' claimed invention is deemed to be obvious, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103 in view of the teachings of Purwar et al '549.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed on October 23, 2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC 103 over Purwar et al '549 are directed entirely to the fact that Purwar et al '549 does not teach the use of the potassium sorbate solution in preventing rust, corrosion or scale. In response, the Examiner would like to point out that Applicants' claims are directed to a solution composition which is defined by its components and not its intended use. The Examiner notes that Applicants' preamble recites the solution as being able to "prevent the formation of rust, corrosion, and scale on metal surfaces that are exposed to it"; however, this recitation is not given any patentable weight. See MPEP 2111.02 where it states that "the preamble is generally not accorded any

Art Unit: 1743

patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure...". Therefore, although Purwar et al '549 may not disclose the use of potassium sorbate in preventing rust or scale, the composition, as claimed by Applicants, is disclosed by the reference. Thus, Applicants' claims remain to be deemed obvious over Purwar et al '549.

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LaToya I. Cross whose telephone number is (703) 305-7360. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.


Art Unit: 1743

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden, can be reached at (703) 308-4037. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-5408.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

LIC

December 21, 2000

  
T. J. H. =  
PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 1743